

REMARKS

This communication is a Response to OFFICE ACTION dated 11/22/2006.

Counsel sincerely thanks the Examiner for further simplifying the restriction, and particularly for allowing Claim 1, which is generic and the parent claim to several other claims.

Counsel also thanks the Examiner for allowing the following claims:

1-2, 12-14, 17-20, 22-24, 26-34 38, 52-56 and 79-82.

Claim 57, which stands rejected , is canceled in this Response.

Claim 58 is taking the place of Claim 57 as parent claim to several dependent claims (Claims 59-73) -- either directly or by mesne sub-parents:

Cancellation of Claim 57 is without prejudice and does not imply any anticipation by US patent 6,324,330, FOLDED LIGHT TUNNEL AND APPARATUS, Stites, November 27, 2001. Stites provides a fine discussion of the problems of shortening a light tunnel. Stites shows in Figures 7, 9 and 11 how beveled prisms serve as transitional faces. (See Stites Claim 1) There are

no such beveled faces is this specification, which shows the use of reflective, orthogonally-disposed, end faces, useful in homogenization. Such reflective end faces are instrumental in making the device the energy-reflecting homogenizer called for by the preambles of both Claims 57 and 58. Counsel has selected Claim 58 as an appropriate statement of the invention. Claim 57 is canceled in the interests of celerity of prosecution. Such reflectivity, particularly of the entry end face, is an important feature of a recycling homogenizer.

Claims 58, 62, 63, 65-67 and 71-73 are subject to objections, primarily dependence from unallowed Claim 57. Claim 58 is now the parent, and has been indicated allowable as corrected. The remaining claims are corrected in this response, by making them dependent on Claim 58 either directly or indirectly. Allowance is requested.

The following claims, subject to restriction, are withdrawn:

3-11, 15-16, 21, 25, 35-37, 39-51, 59-61, 64, 68-70, 74-78.

The current plan is to file divisional applications

Summary Allowance of generic claims 1 and 79 is noted, with thanks to the Examiner. Claim 58, as corrected, has also been indicated allowable as now presented.

Allowance of these parent claims provides basis for allowance of their respective dependent claims, as is generally permitted by the recent MPEP rules. Claim 57 has been canceled without prejudice. All other claims are withdrawn.

Formal allowance is requested.

Kanti Jain, Inventor

By Carl C. Kling
Carl C. Kling, Attorney
(Reg. 19137)